UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,341	12/11/2001	Robert Seliger	S01389/70012 GSE	1518

23628   7590   06/04/2004

WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2211

EXAMINER
LEWIS, CHERYL RENEA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/014,341	SELIGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cheryl Lewis	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-86* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-86* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5 & 6*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-86 are presented for examination.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

2.   The information disclosure statements filed on February 28, 2003, paper no. 5,

and October 20, 2003, paper no. 6, complies with the provisions of MPEP § 609. They

have been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been

considered as to the merits.

DRAWINGS

3.   The applicants' drawings filed on December 11, 2001 have been approved by the

draftsperson.

PRIORITY

4.   Applicant has complied and receives the benefit of priority of an earlier filing date

to application 60/254,753 filed December 11, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-13, 16-33, 49, 72, 76, 79-82, and 84 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed

October 31, 1997, hereinafter Gongwer) and Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March

23, 1994, hereinafter Miller).

7.   Regarding Claims 1, 49, and 72, Gongwer teaches a context management

system for modular software architecture.

The method and associated system for a context management system for modular software architecture as taught or suggested by Gongwer includes:

collecting context data (col. 6, lines 53-67, col. 7, lines 1-8) from a plurality of applications (figure 1, col. 3, lines 9-30) that use the context management system (Abstract, lines 1-7); and storing data corresponding to the collected context data (col. 7, lines 1-7) on a centralized storage location (col. 3, lines 10-30).

However, Gongwer does not expressly teach extracting audit information.

Miller teaches extracting audit information (Abstract, lines 11-16) by processing at least a subset of data (Abstract, lines 11-16, col. 9, lines 39-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gongwer's method of a multi-user access request session in a software architecture with the software architecture of Miller's method because Miller's method could enable the multi-user access request session in a software architecture of Gongwer's method to comprise an audit trail session, wherein the audit trail session provides the productivity of each individual user's usage of the system, each individual user's usage of the system is recorded, and each individual user's usage of the system is analyzed to determine future actions for that particular individual's usage of the system (col. 2, lines 43-58).

8.   Regarding Claim 2, Miller teaches the context data comprises user context data items (Abstract, lines 7-11, col. 3, lines 61-67, col. 4, lines 1-2).

9.   Regarding Claim 5, Miller teaches the audit data comprises application identifying information (col. 9, lines 14-25 and 39-53).

10.   Regarding Claim 6, Gongwer teaches the data corresponding to the collected context data is the same as the context data (col. 6, lines 53-67, col. 7, lines 1-8).

11.   Regarding Claim 11, Gongwer teaches a first application (figure 1 element 20 'Application Software comprising element 24 module 1), a first machine (figure 1, CPU 2_1), a second application (figure 1 element 20 'Application Software comprising element 24 module 2), and a second machine (figure 1, CPU 2_2).

12.   Regarding Claim 12, the limitations of this claim has been noted in the rejection above. In addition, Gongwer teaches a remote server (figure 1, col. 3, lines 5 and 6).

13.   Regarding Claim 13, Gongwer teaches at least two applications on a machine (col. 3, lines 10-25).

14.   Regarding Claim 16, Gongwer teaches query data (col. 5, lines 40-61).

15.   Regarding Claim 17, Miller teaches the software execution over a network (col. 3, lines 30-45).

16.   Regarding Claim 18, Gongwer teaches software executing on a machine housing the centralized storage location (figure 1 element 52, col. 3, line 24-30).

17.   Regarding Claim 19, the limitations of this claim has been noted in the rejection above. In addition, Gongwer teaches an intermediate collection platform (col. 3, lines 10-37).

18.   Regarding Claims 20, 24, and 81, Miller teaches a message queue (col. 8, lines 23-45).

19.   Regarding Claim 21, Miller teaches a storage buffer (col. 7, lines 5-19).

20.   Regarding Claims 22, 26, and 79, the limitations of this claim has been noted in

the rejection above. In addition, Miller teaches an access event for an authorization

under a set of access control rules (col. 5, lines 31-58).

21.   Regarding Claims 23 and 80, Miller teaches preventing execution of the data

access event if the data access event is not authorized (col. 5, lines 31-65).

22.   Regarding Claims 25 and 82, Gongwer teaches a paging server (figure 1,

element 16).

23.   Regarding Claims 27 and 84, Miller teaches the software execution is not subject

to preemption by a user (col. 5, lines 31-65).

24.   Regarding Claims 28 and 76, Gongwer a database (col. 3, lines 29).

25.   Regarding Claim 29, Miller teaches passing the context data between

applications (col. 2, lines 26-31 and 59-66).

26.   Regarding Claim 30, Gongwer teaches collecting active application data (col. 6,

lines 53-67, col. 7, lines 1-8).

27.   Regarding Claim 31, Miller teaches granting an authorized auditor access

(Abstract, lines 11-16, (col. 5, lines 31-65, col. 9, lines 39-53).

28.   Regarding Claim 32, Gongwer teaches identifying a point-of-use machine (figure

1, CPU 2_1).

29.   Regarding Claim 33, Miller teaches evaluating the audit data to make an

assessment of compliance with a set of regulations (Abstract, lines 11-16).

30.   Claims 3, 7-10, 34, and 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997,

hereinafter Gongwer) and Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994,

hereinafter Miller) as applied to claims 1 and 72 above, and further in view of Judge et

al. (Pat. No. 6,401,138 B1 filed October 28, 1996, hereinafter Judge).

31.   Regarding Claim 3, Gongwer and Miller do not expressly teach the context data

comprises patient data items.

However, Judge teaches context data comprises patient data items (Abstract,

lines 5-9 and 12-18, col. 1, lines 39-65, col. 2, lines 4-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the context data applications of Gongwer's and Miller's

methods with the context data applications of Judge because Judge's context data

applications could enable the context data applications of Gongwer and Miller to

comprise a plurality of services for the context data applications of Gongwer's and

Miller's methods, wherein the plurality of services provided to context data applications

is provided by means of an application programming interface (API), registering

application programs to learn about other applications that have registered, registering

application programs for particular events (a change in an item of stored data context

information), and storing data context information received from application programs

and providing this stored data context information to other applications that have

requested particular data context information (col. 1, lines 38-63).

32.   Regarding Claims 7, 9, and 73, Judge teaches the means which essentially

comprises the same means as context management system supports the CCOW

standard set (col. 2, lines 4-15).

33.   Regarding Claims 8 and 75, Judge teaches the plurality of applications support the CCOW standard set (col. 1, lines 37-67).

34.   Regarding Claims 10 and 74, Judge teaches the means which essentially comprise the same means as a first format (col. 1, lines 37-62, col. 8, lines 17-37) complying with the CCOW standard set (col. 1, lines 37-62) and a second data format (col. 1, lines 37-62, col. 8, lines 17-37).

35.   Regarding Claim 34, Judge teaches the means which essentially comprises the same means as regulations of HIPAA (col. 1, lines 37-62, col. 8, lines 17-37).

36.   Claims 4, 14, 15, 77, 78, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997, hereinafter Gongwer); Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter Miller); and Judge et al. (Pat. No. 6,401,138 B1 filed October 28, 1996, hereinafter Judge) as applied to claims 1 and 72 above, and further in view of Quinlan et al. (Pat. No. 6,397,253 B1 filed October 6, 1998, hereinafter Quinlan) and Pizi et al. (Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996, hereinafter Pizi).

37.   Regarding Claims 4, 77, 78, and 83, Gongwer, Miller, and Judge do not expressly teach an application-identifying tag to a URL to yield a compound URL.

Quinlan teaches an application-identifying tag to a URL to yield a compound URL (Abstract, lines 7-15, col. 18, lines 18-54, figures 4a-4b), and a context to identify the application from the application-identifying tag (Abstract, lines 7-15, col. 18, lines 18-54, figures 4a-4b).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the data context applications of Gongwer, Miller, and Judge with the data context applications of Quinlan's method because Quinlan's method enables the data context applications to utilize a context field and a context identifier within a web based environment, where the context field located within a URL identifies a new session connection within the web based environment and the context identifier identifying a value associated with a persistent session connection within the web based environment (col. 5, lines 40-56).

However, Gongwer, Miller, Judge, and Quinlan do not expressly teach a context manager.

Pizi teaches a context manager (col. 7, lines 41-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the data context applications of Gongwer, Miller, Judge, and Quilan with the data context applications of Pizi because Pizi's data context applications could enable the data context applications of Gongwer, Miller, Judge, and Quilan to comprise a context manager, wherein the context manager receives information about the current system environment and provides configuration data to each application that subscribes to the context manager, each application subscribing to the context manager will receive new, updated context information associated with the configuration data and each application can store all or some related information of the configuration data (col. 7, lines 41-67).

38.   Regarding Claims 14 and 15, the limitations of these claims are noted in the
rejection above. In addition, Pizi teaches simultaneous execution (col. 2, lines 53-56).

39.   Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997, hereinafter Gongwer)
and Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter Miller) as applied
to claim 1 above, and further in view of Grambihler et al. (Pat. No. 6,560,655 B1 filed
June 22, 1999, hereinafter Grambihler).

40.   Regarding Claim 35, Gongwer and Miller do not expressly teach a
synchronization scheme.

Grambihler teaches a synchronization scheme (Abstract, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to combine the data application methods of Gongwer and Miller
with the data applications of Grambihler because Grambihler's data applications could
enable the data application methods of Gongwer and Miller to comprise a
synchronization scheme, wherein the synchronization scheme manages the data
synchronization operations for multiple applications according to user preferences and
the synchronization scheme manages data between local and remote computers for
consistent user interfaces for obtaining user preferences (col. 2, lines 1-15).

41.   Claims 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997, hereinafter Gongwer);
Grambihler et al. (Pat. No. 6,560,655 B1 filed June 22, 1999, hereinafter Grambihler);
and Pizi et al. (Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996, hereinafter Pizi).

42.   Regarding Claims 36 and 39, Gongwer teaches receiving context data from the

plurality of sources (Abstract, lines 1-8, (col. 6, lines 53-67, col. 7, lines 1-8 and 64-67,

col. 8, lines 1-3, col. 9, lines 40-67, col. 10, lines 1-36, col. 11, lines 16-34); and storing

the context data in the centralized storage location (col. 3, lines 10-30, col. 7, lines 1-7).

However, Gongwer does not expressly teach a synchronizing scheme.

Grambihler teaches a synchronizing scheme (Abstract, lines 1-9) that includes

data from at least two sources (figures 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the data applications of Gongwer's method with the

data applications of Grambihler's method because Grambihler's data applications could

enable the data applications method of Gongwer to comprise a synchronization

scheme, wherein the synchronization scheme manages the data synchronization

operations for multiple applications according to user preferences and the

synchronization scheme manages data between local and remote computers for

consistent user interfaces for obtaining user preferences (col. 2, lines 1-15).

However, Grambihler does not expressly teach a context manager.

Pizi teaches the context data using a context manager (col. 7, lines 41-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the data applications of Grambihler's method with the

data applications of Pizi's method because Pizi's data applications could enable the

data applications of Grambihler to comprise a context manager, wherein the context

manager receives information about the current system environment and provides

configuration data to each application that subscribes to the context manager, each

application subscribing to the context manager will receive new, updated context

information associated with the configuration data and each application can store all or

some related information of the configuration data (col. 7, lines 41-67).

43.   Regarding Claim 37, Grambihler teaches a network (col. 2, lines 44-63).

44.   Regarding Claim 38, the limitations of this claim has been noted in the rejection

above. In addition, Gongwer teaches an intermediate collection platform (col. 3, lines

10-37).

45.   Regarding Claim 40, Grambihler teaches the synchronization scheme is not

application-vendor-specific (col. 4, lines 13-48).

46.   Regarding Claim 41, Grambihler teaches a first and second data format (col. 8,

lines 37-55).

47.   Claim 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter Miller) and Pizi et al.

(Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996, hereinafter Pizi).

48.   Regarding Claim 42, Miller teaches a data-access event is authorized under a

predetermined rule to allow or deny execution of data-access based (col. 5, lines 31-65)

on content (Abstract, lines 7-11, col. 3, lines 61-67, col. 4, lines 1-2) data corresponding

to the data-access event (col. 5, lines 31-65).

However, Miller does not expressly teach a context manager.

Pizi teaches a context manager (col. 7, lines 41-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the data applications of Miller's method with the data

applications of Pizi's method because Pizi's data applications could enable the data

applications of Miller to comprise a context manager, wherein the context manager

receives information about the current system environment and provides configuration

data to each application that subscribes to the context manager, each application

subscribing to the context manager will receive new, updated context information

associated with the configuration data and each application can store all or some

related information of the configuration data (col. 7, lines 41-67).

49.   Regarding Claims 43-45, Miller teaches a context gesture corresponding to the

data-acces event is authorized or denied execution (col. 5, lines 31-65).

50.   Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997, hereinafter

Gongwer); Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter Miller); and

Judge et al. (Pat. No. 6,401,138 B1 filed October 28, 1996, hereinafter Judge).

51.   Regarding Claim 46, Gongwer teaches collecting context data (col. 6, lines 53-

67, col. 7, lines 1-8) from a plurality of applications (figure 1, col. 3, lines 9-30) that use

the context management system (Abstract, lines 1-7); and storing data corresponding to

the collected context data (col. 7, lines 1-7) on a centralized storage location (col. 3,

lines 10-30).

However, Gongwer does not expressly teach extracting audit information.

Miller teaches extracting audit information (Abstract, lines 11-16) by processing

at least a subset of data (Abstract, lines 11-16, col. 9, lines 39-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Gongwer's method of a multi-user access request

session in a software architecture with the software architecture of Miller's method

because Miller's method could enable the multi-user access request session in a

software architecture of Gongwer's method to comprise an audit trail session, wherein

the audit trail session provides the productivity of each individual user's usage of the

system, each individual user's usage of the system is recorded, and each individual

user's usage of the system is analyzed to determine future actions for that particular

individual's usage of the system (col. 2, lines 43-58).

However, Miller does not expressly teach HIPAA.

Judge teaches the means which essentially comprises the same means as

HIPAA (col. 1, lines 37-62, col. 8, lines 17-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the context data applications of Gongwer's and Miller's

methods with the context data applications of Judge because Judge's context data

applications could enable the context data applications of Gongwer and Miller to

comprise a plurality of services for the context data applications of Gongwer's and

Miller's methods, wherein the plurality of services provided to context data applications

is provided by means of an application programming interface (API), registering

application programs to learn about other applications that have registered, registering

application programs for particular events (a change in an item of stored data context

information), and storing data context information received from application programs

and providing this stored data context information to other applications that have

requested particular data context information (col. 1, lines 38-63).

52.   Regarding Claim 47, Judge teaches the means which essentially comprise the

same means as CCOW standard set (Abstract, lines 5-9 and 12-18, col. 1, lines 39-65,

col. 2, lines 4-15).

53.   Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997, hereinafter Gongwer);

Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter Miller); and Judge et

al. (Pat. No. 6,401,138 B1 filed October 28, 1996, hereinafter Judge) as applied to claim

46 above, and further in view of Pizi et al. (Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996,

hereinafter Pizi).

54.   Regarding Claim 48, Judge teaches a healthcare facility (col. 2, lines 4-15 and

45-58) and the context (col. 2, lines 4-15 and 45-58) data of patient records (col. 2, lines

4-15).

    However, Gongwer, Miller, and Judge do not expressly teach a context manager.

    Pizi teaches a context manager (col. 7, lines 41-67).

    It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the data applications of Gongwer's, Miller's, and

Judge's method with the data applications of Pizi's method because Pizi's data

applications could enable the data applications of Miller to comprise a context manager,

wherein the context manager receives information about the current system

environment and provides configuration data to each application that subscribes to the

context manager, each application subscribing to the context manager will receive new,

updated context information associated with the configuration data and each application

can store all or some related information of the configuration data (col. 7, lines 41-67).

55.   Claims 50-55 and 58-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997,

hereinafter Gongwer); Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter

Miller); and Pizi et al. (Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996, hereinafter Pizi).

56.   Regarding Claims 50-52, 58, and 63-65, Gongwer teaches collecting context

data (col. 6, lines 53-67, col. 7, lines 1-8) from a plurality of software applications (figure

1, col. 3, lines 9-30) that use the context management system (Abstract, lines 1-7); and

storing data corresponding to the collected context data (col. 7, lines 1-7) on a

centralized storage location (col. 3, lines 10-30).

However, Gongwer does not expressly teach extracting audit information.

Miller teaches extracting auditor/audit information (Abstract, lines 11-16) by

processing at least a subset of data (Abstract, lines 11-16, col. 9, lines 39-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Gongwer's method of a multi-user access request

session in a software architecture with the software architecture of Miller's method

because Miller's method could enable the multi-user access request session in a

software architecture of Gongwer's method to comprise an audit trail session, wherein

the audit trail session provides the productivity of each individual user's usage of the system, each individual user's usage of the system is recorded, and each individual user's usage of the system is analyzed to determine future actions for that particular individual's usage of the system (col. 2, lines 43-58).

However, Miller does not expressly teach a context manager.

Pizi teaches a context manager (col. 7, lines 41-67) that manages context data of software applications (col. 7, lines 41-67 and col. 8, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the data applications of Miller's method with the data applications of Pizi's method because Pizi's data applications could enable the data applications of Miller to comprise a context manager, wherein the context manager receives information about the current system environment and provides configuration data to each application that subscribes to the context manager, each application subscribing to the context manager will receive new, updated context information associated with the configuration data and each application can store all or some related information of the configuration data (col. 7, lines 41-67).

57.   Regarding Claim 53, Gongwer teaches a first software application (figure 1 element 20 'Application Software comprising element 24 module 1), a first machine (figure 1, CPU 2_1), a second software application (figure 1 element 20 'Application Software comprising element 24 module 2), and a second machine (figure 1, CPU 2_2).

58.   Regarding Claims 54, 55, and 68, Gongwer teaches a point-of-access machines (figure 1, CPU 2_1) and a server (Abstract, line 8).

59.   Regarding Claims 59 and 66, Miller teaches a message queue (col. 8, lines 23-45).

60.   Regarding Claim 60, Gongwer teaches a paging server (figure 1, element 16).

61.   Regarding Claims 61 and 62, the limitations of this claim has been noted in the rejection above. In addition, Miller teaches an access event for an authorization under a set of access control rules (col. 5, lines 31-58). ·

62.   Regarding Claim 67, Miller teaches a storage buffer (col. 7, lines 5-19).

63.   Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997, hereinafter Gongwer); Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter Miller); and Pizi et al. (Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996, hereinafter Pizi) as applied to claim 50 above, and further in view of Judge et al. (Pat. No. 6,401,138 B1 filed October 28, 1996, hereinafter Judge).

64.   Regarding Claims 56 and 57, Gongwer, Miller, and Pizi do not expressly teach the CCOW standard set.

However, Judge teaches the CCOW standard set (Abstract, lines 5-9 and 12-18, col. 1, lines 39-65, col. 2, lines 4-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the context data applications of Gongwer's, Miller's, and Pizi's methods with the context data applications of Judge because Judge's context data applications could enable the context data applications of Gongwer, Miller, and Pizi to comprise a plurality of services for the context data applications of Gongwer's,

Miller's, and Pizi's methods, wherein the plurality of services provided to context data

applications is provided by means of an application programming interface (API),

registering application programs to learn about other applications that have registered,

registering application programs for particular events (a change in an item of stored

data context information), and storing data context information received from application

programs and providing this stored data context information to other applications that

have requested particular data context information (col. 1, lines 38-63).

65.   Claims 69, 71, 85, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997,

hereinafter Gongwer); Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter

Miller); and Pizi et al. (Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996, hereinafter Pizi) as applied

to claim 50 above, and further in view of Quinlan et al. (Pat. No. 6,397,253 B1 filed

October 6, 1998, hereinafter Quinlan).

66.   Regarding Claims 69 and 71, Gongwer, Miller, and Pizi do not expressly teach

Web-based communications.

        Quinlan teaches Web-based communications (col. 8, lines 40-67).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the data context applications of Gongwer, Miller, and

and Pizi with the data context applications of Quinlan's method because Quinlan's

method enables the data context applications to utilize a context field and a context

identifier within a web based environment, where the context field located within a URL

identifies a new session connection within the web based environment and the context

identifier identifying a value associated with a persistent session connection within the

web based environment (col. 5, lines 40-56).

67.   Regarding Claims 85 and 86 the limitations of these claims have been noted in

the rejection above. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.

68.   Claim 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gongwer et al. (Pat. No. 6,691,118 B1 filed October 31, 1997, hereinafter Gongwer)

and Miller et al. (Pat. No. 5,524,238 filed March 23, 1994, hereinafter Miller); Pizi et al.

(Pat. No. 5,878,258 filed May 6, 1996, hereinafter Pizi); and Quinlan (Pat. No.

6,397,253 B1 filed October 6, 1998, hereinafter Quinlan) as applied to claim 50 above,

and further in view of Grambihler et al. (Pat. No. 6,560,655 B1 filed June 22, 1999,

hereinafter Grambihler).

69.   Regarding Claim 70, Gongwer, Miller, Pizi, and Quinlan do not expressly teach

COM-based.

Grambihler teaches COM-based (Abstract, lines 3 and 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the data application methods of Gongwer, Miller, Pizi,

and Quinlan with the data applications of Grambihler because Grambihler's data

applications could enable the data application methods of Gongwer, Miller, Pizi, and

Quinlan to comprise a synchronization scheme, wherein the synchronization scheme

manages the data synchronization operations for multiple applications according to user

preferences and the synchronization scheme manages data between local and remote

computers for consistent user interfaces for obtaining user preferences (col. 2, lines 1-

15).

CONCLUSION

70.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

Applicant's disclosure.

A.   Fritz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,134,552) discloses a knowledge provider with

logical hyperlinks.

NAME OF CONTACT

80.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cheryl Lewis whose telephone number is (703) 305-

8750. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

(703) 746-5651 (Use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for

"INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal

paper/amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions.).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

Cheryl Lewis
Patent Examiner
May 12, 2004